

94 00762
v. 1

1994 LAND USE ELEMENT REVISION

Volume I

**City of Hermosa Beach
Planning Department**

March 1994

RESOLUTION 94- 5667

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF HERMOSA BEACH, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING AND REVISING THE LAND USE ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN AND ADOPTION OF A MITIGATED ENVIRONMENTAL NEGATIVE DECLARATION.

WHEREAS, on September 7 and September 21, 1993, the Planning Commission held public hearings to consider the revision and update to the Land Use Element, and;

WHEREAS, on October 12, October 26, and November 9, 1993, and January 25, 1994, the City Council held public hearings to consider the revision and update to the Land Use Element and made the following findings:

- A. The revisions and update of the Land Use Element of the General Plan include current goals, policies, and objectives for the general development of the City and, further, designates the proposed general distribution and general location, extent, and type of uses of land throughout the city;
- B. The revised Land Use Element is consistent with other elements of the City's General Plan;
- C. The updated and revised Land Use Element contains the necessary information and analysis to meet the requirements Section 65302 of the Planning and Zoning Law for the State of California;
- D. Based on the evaluation of the Staff Environmental Review Committee of the development policies contained with the Land Use Element, and the goals, objectives, and implementation policies contained therein, and with the incorporation of mitigation measures, the adoption of the Land Use Element



will result in a less than significant impact on the
environment;


NOW, THEREFORE, the the City Council of the City of Hermosa
Beach, does hereby adopt the updated and revised Land Use Element
dated March 1994.

PASSED, APPROVED, and ADOPTED this 22nd day of
March 1994, by:




PRESIDENT of the City Council and MAYOR of the City
of Hermosa Beach, California

ATTEST:




CITY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM:



CITY ATTORNEY

p/pcrshsng



Locationa. Address: City of Hermosa Beachb. Legal: N/ADescription

Revision to the Land Use Element of the General Plan including the establishment of general goals, objectives and policies relating to current and future land uses throughout the city and recommendations for correcting inconsistencies between designations on the General Plan and zoning maps.

Sponsora. Name: City of Hermosa Beachb. Mailing Address: 1315 Valley Drive, Hermosa Beach, CA 90254Phone: (310) 318-0242

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

In accordance with Resolution 89-5229 of the City of Hermosa Beach, which implements the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 in Hermosa Beach, the Environmental Review Committee must make an environmental review of all private projects proposed to be undertaken within the City, and the Planning Commission must make an environmental review of all public projects proposed to be undertaken within the City, which are subject to the Environmental Quality Act. This declaration is documentation of the review and, if it becomes final, no comprehensive Environmental Impact Report is required for this project.

FINDING OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

We have undertaken and completed an Environmental Impact Review of this proposed project in accordance with Resolution 89-5229 of the City Council of Hermosa Beach, and find that this project does not require a comprehensive Environmental Impact Report because, provided the attached mitigation measures are included in the project, it would not have a significant effect on the environment. Documentation supporting this finding is on file in the Planning Department.

2-3-94

Date of FindingKen Roberts
Chairman, Environmental Review Committee

FINDING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

We have undertaken and completed an Environmental Impact Review of this proposed project in accordance with Resolution 89-5229 of the City Council of Hermosa Beach, and find that this project does not require a comprehensive Environmental Impact Report because, provided the attached mitigation measures are included in the project, it would not have a significant effect on the environment. Documentation supporting this finding is on file in the Planning Department.


Date of FindingChairman, Planning Commission

FINDING OF THE CITY COUNCIL

We have undertaken and completed an Environmental Impact Review of this proposed project in accordance with Resolution 89-5229 of the City Council of Hermosa Beach, and find that this project does not require a comprehensive Environmental Impact Report because, provided the attached mitigation measures are included in the project, it would not have a significant effect on the environment. Documentation supporting this finding is on file in the Planning Department.

3-22-94

Date of FindingMayor, Hermosa Beach City Council



Mitigation Measures in regards to the downtown alternative to
reduce parking requirements

1. The City will continue to require parking in-lieu fees, provided via a fund transfer or by direct payment to an improvement fund earmarked specifically for creating parking, in an amount sufficient to off-set increases in required parking. After in-lieu fees are provided for 100 spaces, those 100 spaces must be provided.
2. An ordinance will be established to require bicycle racks/facilities in conjunction with new development or intensification uses of existing buildings
3. A reporting and monitoring program will be established by the City to monitor new building construction, parking space construction, use of alternative forms of transportation, and changes of use of existing buildings, and the total effect on parking demand to determine the feasibility and need for increasing parking supply in the downtown area.

and the... to... in the... to...

The... will... to... in... to...
... to... to... to... to...
... to... to... to... to...
... to... to... to... to...
... to... to... to... to...

... to... to... to... to...
... to... to... to... to...
... to... to... to... to...

... to... to... to... to...
... to... to... to... to...
... to... to... to... to...
... to... to... to... to...
... to... to... to... to...


STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)
CITY OF HERMOSA BEACH)

I, Naoma Valdes, Deputy City Clerk of the City Council of the City of Hermosa Beach, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 94-5667 was duly and regularly passed, approved and adopted by the City Council of the City of Hermosa Beach at a Regular Meeting of said Council at the regular place thereof on March 22, 1994.

The vote was as follows:

AYES: Bowler, Oakes, Reviczky, Mayor Pro Tempore Benz
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Mayor Edgerton

DATED: March 23, 1994



Deputy City Clerk

**1994 Land Use Element Revision
Volume I**

Table of Contents

Title	Page
I. Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Current Land Use Element.....	1
Inconsistencies Between Zoning and General Plan Map.....	2
Building Intensity / Population Density Standards.....	14
Land Use Designation Revisions	14
Land Use and Structural Definitions.....	15
Parking Vis-a-Vis Land Use	15
Open Space / Public Facilities Designations	16
Downtown Alternatives	17
Commercial Space Alternative	18
Reduced Downtown Alternative.....	18
Mixed Use Alternative	19
Commercial / Residential Alternative.....	19
Commercial Recreation Land Use Alternative	20
Local Resident-Serving Alternative.....	21
Residential Alternative.....	21
Status Quo Alternative.....	22
Property Maintenance	22
Design Review	22
Historic Preservation.....	23
II. General Goals, Objectives, and Implementation Policies	24
III. Commercial Space Alternative.....	34
General / Purpose.....	
Potential Advantages	35
Potential Disadvantages	35
Existing Downtown Conditions.....	35
Future Downtown Conditions.....	35
Potential Environmental Impacts.....	37
Fiscal Impacts	40
Potential Coastal Commission Reaction.....	40
Relationship to R/UDAT	41
Implementation	41
Expanded Downtown Business Area Enhancement District Map.....	44

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

LAND USE ELEMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. INTRODUCTION

The State mandated requirements for general plan land use elements are set forth in Government Code Section 65302(a). According to the State Office of Planning and Research, the legal requirements for an adequate land use element are: (1) the land use diagram (map); (2) standards for population density; (3) standards for building intensity; (4) identification of future solid waste disposal sites, if applicable; and (5) a discussion of the relationship between the Land Use Element and the Circulation and Noise Elements.

II. GENERAL GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

- GOAL 1: Protect and maintain the small town beach community atmosphere of Hermosa Beach.
- GOAL 2: Accommodate existing and future commercial land uses to provide service to both local residents and regional shoppers.
- GOAL 3: Encourage land uses which enhance and promote the City's coastal environment.
- GOAL 4: Provide for the development and maintenance of public infrastructure to adequately serve the needs of residents and permitted land uses.
- GOAL 5: Provide community resource facilities which will adequately support the needs of local residents and businesses.
- GOAL 6: Maintain existing land use standards and controls for the commercial and industrial districts.

III CURRENT LAND USE ELEMENT

The City's Land Use Element has been slightly modified since the 1979 revision. In its present form, the Land Use Element does not meet the minimum requirements of State law as set forth in Government Code Section 65302(a). The current Land Use Element is legally deficient in the following areas: (1) inconsistency between text and diagram regarding the the Mobile Home Park, General Commercial, and Open Space land use designations; and (2) total absence of building intensity standards for all nonresidential land use designations. The legal inadequacy of the Land Use Element could threaten the legality of other General Plan Elements, particularly the Circulation and Noise Elements.

IV. INCONSISTENCIES BETWEEN ZONING AND GENERAL PLAN MAP

State law requires consistency between the zoning and general plan maps of local governments. This study identifies all properties within the City, grouped into 11 areas, that have zoning designations inconsistent with the General Plan designation.

Recommendations

Area 1: 737 and 739 Longfellow Avenue. Redesignate to LD Low Density from GC General Commercial.

Area 2: 734, 736, 738, 740, and 744 Longfellow Avenue; 733, 735, 737, and 739 30th Street. Redesignate to LD Low Density from GC General Commercial.

Area 3: the grassy undeveloped northerly portion of the Hermosa Valley School site. Rezone to OS Open Space from R-3 Multiple Family Residential.

Area 4: 803, 805, 807, 809, 811, 813, 815, 817, and 819 18th Street; 802 and 804 19th Street; 181, 1820, 1822, 1830, 1834, 1840 and 1850 Pacific Coast Highway. Rezone from R-2 to Commercial S.P.A. Specific Plan Area.

Area 5: 1906, 1918, 1924, and 1934 Pacific Coast Highway. Rezone from R-2 to Commercial S.P.A. Specific Plan Area.

Area 6: 825, 827, 831, 833, 835, 841, and 844 13th Street; 830, 840 and 850 14th Street. Redesignate to MD Medium Density from GC General Commercial (with the exception of the R-1 lot, which should be redesignated to LD Low Density).

Area 7: 1235, 1245, 1251, and 1255 Prospect Avenue. Redesignate lot #40 to GC General Commercial and rezone the remaining parcels to R-1 One Family Residential from C-3 General Commercial.

Area 8: 725 10th Street and 730 11th Street. Rezone these properties to R-2 Two Family Residential from C-3 General Commercial.

Area 9: 603 1st Place, 620 2nd Street, and 112, 138 and 142 Ardmore Avenue. Rezone these properties to R-2 Two Family Residential from M-1 Light Manufacturing.


Area 10: 603, 605, 607, 609, 611, 613, 615, and 623 3rd Street; 322, 330 and 342 Ardmore Avenue. Rezone these properties to R-2 Two Family Residential from M-1 Light Manufacturing.

Area 11: 611, 615, and 635 4th Street; and 422-436 Ardmore Avenue. Rezone these properties to R-2 Two Family Residential from M-1 Light Manufacturing.


Map 1

Area 1 Inconsistencies


Redesignate LD Low Density from GC General Commercial



TENNISON



Map 3
Area 3 Inconsistencies
Rezone to OS Open Space from R-3 Multiple Family Residential



The map shows Block I, bounded by Pacific Coast Highway to the west, 18th Street to the south, 19th Street to the north, and Rhodes Street to the east. The map includes a scale bar and a north arrow.

Lot Dimensions and Numbers:

- Lot 1:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 2:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 3:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 4:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 5:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 6:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 7:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 8:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 9:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 10:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 11:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 12:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 13:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 14:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 15:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 16:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 17:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 18:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 19:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 20:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 21:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 22:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 23:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 24:** 180' x 180'
- Lot 25:** 180' x 180'


Block Dimensions:

- Block I:** 180' x 180'

Other Features:

- 18TH ST.** (South boundary)
- 19TH ST.** (North boundary)
- RHODES ST.** (East boundary)
- PACIFIC COAST HWY.** (West boundary)
- BLK. I** (Block label)
- CITY** (City label)

Map 5
Area 5 Inconsistencies
Rezone from R-2 to Commercial S.P.A. Specific Plan Area



Map 6

Area 6 Inconsistencies


Redesignate to MD Medium Density from GC General Commercial
(With the exception of the R-1 lot, which should be redesignated to LD Low Density)



Map 7

Area 7 Inconsistencies

Redesignate lot #40 to GC General Commercial and rezone the remaining parcels to R-1 One Family Residential from C-3 General Commercial



ARDMORE AVE. 30

11TH ST. 40

10TH ST. 40

PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY 90

BLK. 78

SHEET 1

SHEET 2

LOT 1 POR.

LOT 2 POR.

LOT 3 POR.

LOT 4 POR.

LOT 5

LOT 6

LOT 7

LOT 8

LOT 9

LOT 10

LOT 11

LOT 12

LOT 13

LOT 14

LOT 15

LOT 16

LOT 17

LOT 18

LOT 19

LOT 20

LOT 21

LOT 22

LOT 23

LOT 24

LOT 25

LOT 26

BLK. 2

10th St. 36.04

11th St. 36.04

12th St. 36.04

13th St. 36.04

14th St. 36.04

15th St. 36.04

16th St. 36.04

17th St. 36.04

18th St. 36.04

19th St. 36.04

20th St. 36.04

21st St. 36.04

22nd St. 36.04

23rd St. 36.04

24th St. 36.04

25th St. 36.04

26th St. 36.04

27th St. 36.04

28th St. 36.04

29th St. 36.04

30th St. 36.04

31st St. 36.04

32nd St. 36.04

33rd St. 36.04

34th St. 36.04

35th St. 36.04

36th St. 36.04

37th St. 36.04

38th St. 36.04

39th St. 36.04

40th St. 36.04

41st St. 36.04

42nd St. 36.04

43rd St. 36.04

44th St. 36.04

45th St. 36.04

46th St. 36.04

47th St. 36.04

48th St. 36.04

49th St. 36.04

50th St. 36.04

51st St. 36.04

52nd St. 36.04

53rd St. 36.04

54th St. 36.04

55th St. 36.04

56th St. 36.04

57th St. 36.04

58th St. 36.04

59th St. 36.04

60th St. 36.04

61st St. 36.04

62nd St. 36.04

63rd St. 36.04

64th St. 36.04

65th St. 36.04

66th St. 36.04

67th St. 36.04

68th St. 36.04

69th St. 36.04

70th St. 36.04

71st St. 36.04

72nd St. 36.04

73rd St. 36.04

74th St. 36.04

75th St. 36.04

76th St. 36.04

77th St. 36.04

78th St. 36.04

79th St. 36.04

80th St. 36.04

81st St. 36.04

82nd St. 36.04

83rd St. 36.04

84th St. 36.04

85th St. 36.04

86th St. 36.04

87th St. 36.04

88th St. 36.04

89th St. 36.04

90th St. 36.04

91st St. 36.04

92nd St. 36.04

93rd St. 36.04

94th St. 36.04

95th St. 36.04

96th St. 36.04

97th St. 36.04

98th St. 36.04

99th St. 36.04

100th St. 36.04

101st St. 36.04

102nd St. 36.04

103rd St. 36.04

104th St. 36.04

105th St. 36.04

106th St. 36.04

107th St. 36.04

108th St. 36.04

109th St. 36.04

110th St. 36.04

111th St. 36.04

112th St. 36.04

113th St. 36.04

114th St. 36.04

115th St. 36.04

116th St. 36.04

117th St. 36.04

118th St. 36.04

119th St. 36.04

120th St. 36.04

121st St. 36.04

122nd St. 36.04

123rd St. 36.04

124th St. 36.04

125th St. 36.04

126th St. 36.04

127th St. 36.04

128th St. 36.04

129th St. 36.04

130th St. 36.04

131st St. 36.04

132nd St. 36.04

133rd St. 36.04

134th St. 36.04

135th St. 36.04

136th St. 36.04

137th St. 36.04

138th St. 36.04

139th St. 36.04

140th St. 36.04

141st St. 36.04

142nd St. 36.04

143rd St. 36.04

144th St. 36.04

145th St. 36.04

146th St. 36.04

147th St. 36.04

148th St. 36.04

149th St. 36.04

150th St. 36.04

151st St. 36.04

152nd St. 36.04

153rd St. 36.04

154th St. 36.04

155th St. 36.04

156th St. 36.04

157th St. 36.04

158th St. 36.04

159th St. 36.04

160th St. 36.04

161st St. 36.04

162nd St. 36.04

163rd St. 36.04

164th St. 36.04

165th St. 36.04

166th St. 36.04

167th St. 36.04

168th St. 36.04

169th St. 36.04

170th St. 36.04

171st St. 36.04

172nd St. 36.04

173rd St. 36.04

174th St. 36.04

175th St. 36.04

176th St. 36.04

177th St. 36.04

178th St. 36.04

179th St. 36.04

180th St. 36.04

181st St. 36.04

182nd St. 36.04

183rd St. 36.04

184th St. 36.04

185th St. 36.04

186th St. 36.04

187th St. 36.04

188th St. 36.04

189th St. 36.04

190th St. 36.04

191st St. 36.04

192nd St. 36.04

193rd St. 36.04

194th St. 36.04

195th St. 36.04

196th St. 36.04

197th St. 36.04

198th St. 36.04

199th St. 36.04

200th St. 36.04

201st St. 36.04

202nd St. 36.04

203rd St. 36.04

204th St. 36.04

205th St. 36.04

206th St. 36.04

207th St. 36.04

208th St. 36.04


209th St. 36.04

210th St. 36.04


211st St. 36.04

212nd St. 36.04


Map 9
Area 9 Inconsistencies
Rezone these properties to R-2 Two Family Residential from M-1 Light Manufacturing



Map 10
Area 10 Inconsistencies
Rezone these properties to R-2 Two Family Residential from M-1 Light Manufacturing



Map 11
Area 11 Inconsistencies
Rezone these properties to R-2 Two Family Residential from M-1 Light Manufacturing



V. BUILDING INTENSITY/POPULATION DENSITY STANDARDS

Statutory law does not provide any precise guidelines for establishing adequate building intensity or population density standards, which is undoubtedly intentional in order to give local jurisdictions flexibility in determining their own standards.

The City's current standard of maximum dwelling units per acre is considered acceptable by State guidelines for both residential population density and building intensity standards. However, the current Land Use Element does not have any population density or building intensity standards for the Mobile Home Park designation.

The most significant deficiency in the current Land Use Element is the complete lack of building intensity standards for nonresidential land uses. This is problematic for the City in terms of both the legal adequacy of the Land Use Element and the absence of General Plan guidance in regards to zoning regulations and long range planning. Various types of building intensity measures, e.g. floor area ratio, are discussed, and sample standards from other communities are provided.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the City adopt a widely understood nonresidential building intensity standard such as floor area ratio for the present time in order to bring the Land Use Element into compliance with State law. A special study could be conducted at a later date on more sophisticated, but rarely used, measures such building volume ratio to determine if such a standard would offer more advantages than floor area ratio in defining structural bulk and development potential.

VI. LAND USE DESIGNATION REVISIONS

The purpose of this section is to examine current General Plan land use designations that exhibit one or both of the following characteristics: (1) inconsistency with the existing land uses; and (2) inconsistency with the existing character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the City consider a low density or Specific Plan Area designation in Area I because of substandard lot sizes. In addition, the City should eliminate the R-P zoning and replace it with R-3 zoning, or create a new General Plan land use designation for residential/office mixes.

VII. LAND USE AND STRUCTURAL DEFINITIONS

There is presently a need in the City for more precise commercial land use definitions to accomplish the following two goals: (1) ensure greater predictability of the operating characteristics of both existing and future land uses; and (2) provide stronger land use controls to prevent negative external impacts from business operations to surrounding properties.

Dual/multiple uses are a particular concern to the City since this is an intensification of land use that can lead to numerous potential impacts to surrounding land uses. Land use intensification can involve the following factors: (1) desirability of the land use; (2) unfair competition; (3) incompatibility with surrounding land uses; (4) land uses inconsistent with zoning standards; (5) public nuisance potential; and (6) potential for increased crime activity.

Various structural features, e.g. attic, basement, floor area, grade, loft, and story, are often either vaguely defined or not defined at all in building and planning applications. This situation opens the possibility for the inconsistent application of interpretations that could be legally challenged as arbitrary and capricious.

Recommendation

Much of the potential difficulties and controversies involved with dual/multiple uses and structural features can be adequately resolved by formulating precise definitions that will provide clear and unambiguous guidance for local decision-makers.

VIII. PARKING VIS-A-VIS LAND USE

The City's commercial districts have long been distinguished by the following land use and parking characteristics: (1) small commercial properties that were subdivided back in the early part of this century, when provision for off-street parking space was not encouraged or even desirable since maximizing the number of new lots was often the primary consideration; (2) high business turnover rates that can result in different types of retailers, with differing parking demand potential, occupying the same commercial space; and (3) existing commercial uses that do not meet current parking standards due to a lack of available space for on-site parking.

In the past, the City did not require parking for residential development, and at one time the City restricted developers from establishing on-site parking in conjunction with residential development. From observation, it is apparent that many residential developments are lacking adequate parking, and that finding street parking in residential areas can be almost impossible at times. The results of the parking survey for the four major commercial districts indicates that public parking can adequately accommodate demand in the downtown and Pier Avenue

corridors, while Aviation Boulevard and Pacific Coast Highway partons must rely on private off-street parking.

Recommendations

A number of potential approaches to improving the City's commercial parking space inventory are discussed, including: (1) flexible commercial parking standards, including shared parking facilities; (2) new commercial public parking facilities, including public parking structures; and (3) potential increases/reductions in commercial parking standards based on the results of the commercial district parking survey. The feasibility of revising residential parking standards is also discussed, including off-site residential parking.

The following are recommended in this study:

1. Encourage private sector construction and operation of downtown public parking structures;
2. Encourage shared parking arrangements for both existing commercial uses and future commercial developments;
3. Retain existing zoning standards on the required number of parking spaces for all commercial land uses; and
4. Allow more "intense" commercial uses to locate into commercial properties previously occupied by uses exempt from parking regulations if the required parking spaces over and above the parking requirement for the previous use can be provided.

IX. OPEN SPACE/PUBLIC FACILITIES DESIGNATIONS

The current OS Open Space land use designation in the General Plan includes several types of public land uses not typically associated with the concept of "open space." The OS designation presently combines two completely different types of publicly owned lands: recreational/open space areas and institutional/public facility properties.

Recommendation

In order to correct the existing deficiencies in the OS designation, either of the following two options could be initiated: (1) establish a new PF Public Facilities land use designation for educational buildings, public utility structures and corridors, public governmental buildings, public malls and plazas, and transit uses; or (2) create a new PF Public Facilities overlay district for the permitted Open Space uses listed in option #1.

X. DOWNTOWN ALTERNATIVES

Background

Downtowns in older Southern California communities such as Hermosa Beach were originally developed in the 1920s-30s, reflecting the subdivision and construction patterns of that period: narrow lots with compact ground level retail space in one and two story masonry buildings. Although retail market demand continued to grow with the regional population, these downtown districts could not expand horizontally, since surrounding neighborhoods were already developed, or vertically, due to construction costs. The lack of developable land also constrained the expansion of parking facilities.

As the automobile made it easier for shoppers to travel longer distances, purchasing decisions could be made on a regional as well as local level. As residents from neighboring communities began to shift shopping patterns away from locally oriented downtowns to regionally serving highway corridors, retailers offering smaller comparison goods and convenience items also began relocating from downtowns to newly developing shopping centers. The inherent market advantages of shopping centers and malls gradually drained older downtown districts of the more general retail anchor stores.

The existing mix of commercial retailers in downtown Hermosa Beach is the result of regional economic trends combined with a relative absence of public sector intervention or assistance in determining the downtown's character and market niche. Throughout the history of downtown Hermosa Beach, the City has basically allowed free market conditions to determine overall land use patterns. Until recently, no conditional use regulations or detailed restrictions on permitted uses were applied to downtown properties. Downtown marketing activities have primarily focused on special Chamber of Commerce events, e.g. Fiesta de las Artes, and special sporting events, e.g. volleyball tournaments.

Development patterns throughout the South Bay over the past few decades have effectively "captured" much of the market share for both general merchandise and entertainment/specialty shopping demands. The market for general shopping needs is well represented by competing South Bay shopping malls, many with easy freeway access. The ability to draw entertainment and tourist dollars is also under heavy competition from established South Bay entertainment and specialty shopping districts, many located close to the beachfront.

The following is a discussion of a variety of options the City has for the downtown area. No specific recommendations are being made regarding any of these alternatives. These alternatives are essentially provided for discussion purposes, and to try to provide an analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative.

Commercial Space Alternative

This alternative would maximize the amount of commercial space in downtown by converting all nonconforming residential uses in downtown to commercial uses. All existing residential uses would be subject to a specific amortization period, during which time no residential structural improvements or expansions would be permitted.

Potential Advantages: (1) larger stock of downtown commercial structures provides opportunity for greater variety of retailers and greater selection of retail goods; (2) new commercial construction would result in greater property tax revenues; (3) greater shopping opportunities that could attract a larger and more diversified shopper base; (4) opportunity for greater sales and business license tax revenues; (5) potential for increased employment; and (6) promote downtown as a unified shopping district characterized by a variety of restaurants and specialty shops.

Potential Disadvantages: (1) reduction in housing stock that could adversely impact City's supply of low and moderate income housing units; (2) potential increase in alcohol-related commercial uses; and (3) greater intensification of day and night-time shoppers could create conflicts with nearby residents in terms of parking, accessibility, noise and lighting spillover effects.

Reduced Downtown Alternative

This alternative would reduce the overall size of the downtown commercial district by redesignating targeted properties along the downtown periphery to residential zoning. Although this alternative discusses all the targeted properties, an option would be to do only a select group. The general rationale for considering a reduction is that over the last 30 years or more, the demand for commercial space has been almost negligible and some vacant properties have been unable to attract developers. Furthermore, much of the downtown periphery is already residential.

Potential Advantages: (1) eliminates vacant and underutilized commercial properties and deficient/deteriorating commercial structures located along the downtown periphery; (2) new residential properties will provide more housing opportunities and will increase property tax revenues; (3) close proximity of shops to new residential development will increase casual pedestrian shopper activity; and (4) creates more demand for the remaining downtown commercial area as a unified shopping district.

Potential Disadvantages: (1) reduction of downtown commercial properties, limiting opportunities for outside retailers to relocate into existing downtown vacant/underutilized retail space; (2) reduction in number of commercial retail properties that could offer employment opportunities; (3) greater

commercial concentration and proximity of new residents could cause conflicts in terms of parking, accessibility, noise, and lighting spillover effects; (4) creates momentum for business flight to larger commercial districts with established shopper base (domino theory); and (5) contributes to a perception of City as "anti-business."

Mixed Use Alternative

This alternative would create a new land use designation, Downtown Mixed Use, that would allow both residential and commercial uses on the same property. Residential uses would be permitted on the upper levels if the structure also contains commercial uses. All commercial uses would be subject to the GC General Commercial land use standards, while all residential uses would be subject to the HD High Density land use standards. Properties containing both commercial and residential land uses would be subject to both commercial and residential standards, as applicable.

Potential Advantages: (1) allows a wide variety of potential land uses throughout downtown, thereby providing greater incentives for property owners to more fully invest in their properties; (2) provides opportunities to increase the City's low and moderate income housing stock; (3) provides opportunities for larger local shopper base due to growth in downtown resident population, thereby potentially increasing sale tax revenues and the variety of retail outlets; (4) provides incentives to upgrade existing underutilized properties, resulting in increased property tax revenues; and (5) creates a distinctive urban downtown environment that could contribute to a more positive image of downtown.

Potential Disadvantages: (1) mixed use developments are difficult to finance and insure, except for mixed use developments with low and moderate income units, and few developers are interested in this type of construction; (2) mixed use developments may not fit the relatively low density residential character of the City, creating potential conflicts with surrounding residents in terms of circulation, parking, lighting and noise impacts; (3) allowing residential development in the downtown could effectively replace existing commercial developments with high income residential units, leading to opposition from local merchants on the perception that the City is "anti-business."

Commercial/Residential Alternative

This alternative would create a new land use designation for the downtown, Commercial/Residential, that would allow either entirely commercial or entirely residential uses on each downtown property. All commercial uses would be subject to the GC General Commercial land use standards, while all residential uses would be subject to the HD High Density land use standards.

Potential Advantages: (1) allows downtown property owners greater incentives to invest in currently underutilized properties, since residential beachfront developments would have a higher investment return than commercial developments, leading to greater property tax revenues; (2) provides opportunities for larger local shopper base with potential growth in downtown resident population; (3) provides greater options to property owners, creating a more free market approach by maximizing the economically highest and best property use.

Potential Disadvantages: (1) potential high density residential development could lead to traffic congestion and create commercial/residential conflicts; (2) allowing residential development in the downtown could effectively replace existing commercial developments with residential units, leading to opposition from local merchants and an "anti-business" image for the City; (3) future residential development represents "lost opportunities" to attract new commercial establishments into downtown and increase the City's sales tax revenues.

Commercial Recreation Land Use Alternative

This alternative would create a new commercial land use designation, Downtown Commercial, that specifically limits permitted land uses to commercial activities considered entertaining or recreational in nature. The intent is to establish a well-defined image of downtown as a beachfront "entertainment/restaurant row" that would be particularly appealing to visitors from outside the community.

Potential Advantages: (1) opportunity to create a distinctive and positive image of the downtown; (2) increased sales tax revenues by emphasizing a greater concentration of land uses with high sales returns per square foot of floor space, e.g. upscale restaurants, jewelry and gift boutiques; (3) greater employment opportunities for local residents by encouraging labor-intensive land uses such as restaurants; (4) greater selection and diversity among the permitted types of uses by encouraging greater concentrations of competing businesses; (5) encourages property investment/upgrading to successfully market permitted land uses, thereby increasing property tax revenues.

Potential Disadvantages: (1) the limited number of permitted uses could prevent other types of retailers from coming to downtown; (2) the limited permitted uses could contribute to an "anti-business" image of the City, possibly driving away existing businesses; (3) a "restaurant row" concept may appeal primarily to cocktail lounge-oriented eating establishments, thus increasing the potential for crime-related problems; (4) owners of properties with land uses that become existing nonconforming uses as a result of this alternative, e.g. residential, office, could be discouraged from making future property investments/upgradings; (5) this alternative requires activist role by the City or Chamber of Commerce to successfully promote downtown to prospective restaurant entrepreneurs and customers.

Local Resident-Serving Alternative

This alternative would create a new commercial land use designation, Downtown Commercial, that is specifically intended to serve the shopping and employment needs of local residents. While regional-serving commercial uses, e.g. live entertainment, would also be permitted, the emphasis of this alternative is to encourage those commercial retail and service enterprises that cater to local consumer demands and discourage other uses.

Potential Advantages: (1) opportunity to increase sale tax revenues by focusing on specific, built-in market; (2) local resident-serving retail establishments would be less likely to attract outside patrons who produce public service demands without contributing to the costs of such services, e.g. police calls; and (3) local resident shoppers tend to be a more stable, year-round, long-term group in terms of consumption patterns than beach visitors and other outside groups.

Potential Disadvantages: (1) concentration on local shopping needs could forego opportunities to establish new regionally-oriented entertainment establishments; (2) local residents may represent too small a consumer group to make this alternative economically viable; and (3) the type of retail establishments targeted in this alternative, e.g. household goods, personal services, would directly compete with regional malls and shopping centers located throughout the South Bay.

Residential Alternative

This alternative would change the land use designation of all commercial downtown properties to HD High Density Residential. All existing commercial land uses would become legal nonconforming uses subject to a specific amortization period. This alternative is based on the assumption that any revitalization efforts for the downtown commercial retail base would have a low probability of success. The local retail market has already been saturated by commercial centers in other surrounding municipalities. Given the downtown's built-in competitive and locational disadvantages, downtown consumer demand will continue to be limited to local resident and seasonal beach visitors.

Potential Advantages: (1) new residential construction and property improvement/upgrading would result in greater property tax revenues; (2) conversion of downtown nightclubs and taverns to residential uses would reduce downtown crime rates; (3) elimination of downtown taverns and public areas removes incentive for transients to utilize beachfront areas; (4) removal of marginal businesses with low sales tax revenue and high turnover rates; and (5) increase in residential properties would help the City meet its share of the SCAG Regional Housing Needs.

Potential Disadvantages: (1) permanent loss of unique beachfront retail district; (2) loss of sales and business license tax revenues; (3) displacement of existing downtown retailers and

residents through property conversions could result in litigation against City; (4) existing marginal downtown businesses may continue indefinitely as legal nonconforming uses while challenging the legality of the amortization process, discouraging potential residential developments; (5) severe opposition from the Chamber of Commerce and other local business organizations which could result in litigation against City; and (6) contributes to an "anti-business" image of the City that could drive away businesses located outside of downtown, further reducing sales tax and business license revenues.

Status Quo Alternative

This alternative would not change any land use designation in or around the downtown commercial district. The future of downtown would be generally dependent upon market conditions with little public sector intervention.

Potential Advantages: (1) no potentially hostile controversy from opponents to land use changes.

Potential Disadvantages: (1) the present downtown land use conditions are unlikely to improve by market forces alone, e.g. property underutilization, marginal retail businesses, high business turnover rates, mixed/incompatible uses, and alcohol-related police calls; and (2) the unaddressed underutilization of downtown represents lost opportunities to generate more sales, property and business license tax revenues.

XI. PROPERTY MAINTENANCE

Substandard property maintenance is a blighting influence that can substantially reduce the aesthetic and economic value of surrounding properties. The most common residential property maintenance problems in the City are usually not severe in terms of public health and safety, e.g. weathered facades, overgrown vegetation. However, there have been instances reported of property neglect that is capable of endangering occupants or nearby residents, e.g. rodent infestation.

The only specific property maintenance regulations for the City are found in Chapter 20, Nuisances, of the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code. Other property maintenance regulations enforced by the City are the State Building Code structural and use standards.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the City formulate a property maintenance ordinance that provides a specific abatement process.

XII. DESIGN REVIEW

The application of specific design standards to the plan review process can result in a higher aesthetic quality in future developments. If such standards are clearly articulated and

consistently applied, design review also allows for more predictability in the planning process for both applicants and local officials. However, in order for design review to be effective, the intent of such a program should be well defined from the outset.

Recommendation

The City's Precise Development Plan procedures presently authorizes the Planning Commission to conduct generalized, nonspecific design review as part of its overall site plan review duties for projects requiring discretionary approvals. Alternatives to this approach could involve the creation of an independent Design Review Committee with separate membership, delegation of specified design review duties to the Planning Director/Planning Department, or retention of an outside consultant to perform design reviews and provide recommendations to the Planning Department.

XIII. HISTORIC PRESERVATION

The legal background and State registration procedures for historic properties and sites is discussed in this section. The requirements for a Certified Local Ordinance and Certified Local Government status is also outlined.

Recommendation

An exhaustive list of properties and sites that could qualify as Locally Significant Resources is provided. No specific recommendations are made regarding the qualifications of any of these potential historic candidates.

p/execsum

**GENERAL GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND
IMPLEMENTATION POLICIES**

GENERAL GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND IMPLEMENTATION POLICIES

Legend: E - Local Government Power Expansion
R - Local Government Power Reduction
N/C - No Change in Level of Local Government Power
S - State Mandated

GOAL 1: Protect, improve and maintain the quality of life and the small town beach community atmosphere of Hermosa Beach. N/C

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 1.1: Preserve the existing character of all residential neighborhoods. N/C

Implementation Objective 1.1-1: Require discretionary review of future developments and modifications that conflict with the character of the surrounding residential neighborhood. N/C with E potential

Implementation Policy 1.1-1: Residential developments at greater densities than permitted by the General Plan land use designation are prohibited. N/C

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 1.2: Minimize conflicts between nonresidential land uses and residential properties. N/C with E potential

Implementation Objective 1.2-1: Restrict any types of land use conversions or forms of ownership which directly or indirectly result in land uses and/or land intensities that are incompatible with the surrounding uses. N/C with E potential

Implementation Objective 1.2-2: Prevent the establishment or continuation of any incompatible nonresidential land uses on properties with a residential General Plan land use designation. N/C for establishment; E for continuation

Implementation Policy 1.2-1: All nonresidential land uses adjacent to residential properties must provide buffers and/or building setbacks to adequately protect nearby residential properties from adverse impacts. N/C

Implementation Policy 1.2-2: An adequate separation must be provided from the lot line of a residential property to the exterior building wall of future nonresidential land uses characterized by potentially objectionable operations, e.g. adult businesses, alcohol beverage establishments. N/C

Implementation Policy 1.2-3: Nonresidential land uses are prohibited from subjecting nearby residential properties to objectionable air, noise, glare and other environmental impacts. N/C

GOAL 2: Accommodate existing and future commercial land uses to provide service to both local residents and regional visitors. N/C

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 2.1: Maintain the "small town" retail and service character of commercially designated properties located along existing commercial corridors. N/C

Implementation Objective 2.1-1: Establish specific maximum building intensity standards, e.g. floor area ratio, for every commercial zone. S

Implementation Objective 2.1-2: Establish maximum building height standards for every General Plan commercial land use designation. N/C

Implementation Objective 2.1-3: Require discretionary review of commercial or industrial uses that could create adverse environmental impacts for the surrounding area. N/C

Implementation Policy 2.1-1: The establishment of incompatible land uses, e.g. residential or industrial, on properties located in commercial shopping districts is prohibited. N/C

Implementation Policy 2.1-2: Commercial developments must provide sufficient off-street parking spaces or provide other means to minimize parking shortages. N/C

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 2.2: Promote the establishment and improvement of commercial enterprises which contribute to the vitality and diversity of the City's commercial base. N/C

Implementation Objective 2.2-1: Require pedestrian-oriented design in commercial structures along Pier Avenue and within the commercial downtown district. N/C

GOAL 3: Encourage land uses which enhance and promote the City's coastal environment and quality of life. N/C

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 3.1: Accommodate coastal-related recreation and commercial uses which serve the year-round needs of visitors and residents. N/C

Implementation Objective 3.1-1: Provide a specific list of coastal-related recreation and commercial uses for the downtown district and specific definitions of such uses. E

Implementation Objective 3.1-2: Allow special weekend daytime events in the downtown district that will serve both residents and visitors without infringing on private property rights. N/C

Implementation Objective 3.1-3: Allow the continued use of the City's public beaches for coastal recreational uses. N/C

Implementation Policy 3.1-1: All future coastal-related developments must be designed with a high level of architectural design quality which reflects the City's unique coastal location. E

GOAL 4: Provide for the development and maintenance of public infrastructure to adequately serve the needs of residents and permitted land uses. N/C

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 4.1: Continue operation and maintenance of public infrastructure. N/C

Implementation Objective 4.1-1: Commit the necessary public funds and personnel for public infrastructure improvements and repairs. N/C

GOAL 5: Provide community resource facilities which will adequately support the needs of local residents and businesses. N/C

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 5.1: Maintain adequate funding and personnel for the provision of recreational, educational, and cultural programs and facilities. N/C

Implementation Objective 5.1-1: Establish monitoring program of public demand for various programs and facilities to ensure commitment of adequate funding and staff to meet current and anticipated user needs. E

Implementation Objective 5.1-2: Allow for appropriate private interests to use and or lease surplus public properties and facilities. N/C

Implementation Objective 5.1-3: Accommodate religious, educational and day care facilities in residential neighborhoods, provided such facilities are compatible in function, scale and character to the immediate neighborhood. N/C

GOAL 6: Maintain existing land use standards and controls for the commercial and industrial districts. N/C

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 6.1: Protect surrounding residential neighborhoods from adverse environmental impacts. N/C

Implementation Objective 6.1-1: Mitigate impacts of expansion of commercial development in relation to adjacent residential land uses. N/C

Implementation Policy 6.1-1: The expansion of industrial land uses into adjacent residential properties is prohibited. N/C

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 6.2: Encourage community participation in significant discretionary land use decisions. N/C

GOAL 7: Preserve public open spaces and scenic vistas throughout the City. N/C

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 7.1: Ensure that future development will not encroach on or diminish public open spaces, public views, or unique natural resources. N/C

Implementation Policy 7.1-1 Establish specific criteria for preserving and protecting public open spaces and views. N/C

GOAL 8: The City should engage in planning activities to encourage commercial development to maintain a sufficient revenue base to ensure the adequate provision of public services and facilities. N/C

GOAL 9: Encourage equitable community access and participation on all discretionary land use decisions. N/C

CURRENT LAND USE ELEMENT

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 1: Revise the City's Land Use Element text to: (1) include discussions on the general types of permitted uses for the Mobile Home Park, General Commercial, and Open Space land use designations; and (2) include building intensity standards for all nonresidential land use designations. S

INCONSISTENCIES BETWEEN ZONING AND GENERAL PLAN MAP

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 1: Obtain consistency between the General Plan map and the zoning map for all properties within the City. S

Implementation Objective 1.1: The following land use changes shall be made: N/C

Area 1: 737 and 739 Longfellow Avenue. Redesignate to LD Low Density from GC General Commercial.

Area 2: 734, 736, 738, 740, and 744 Longfellow Avenue; 733, 735, 737, and 739 30th Street. Redesignate to LD Low Density from GC General Commercial.

Area 3: the grassy undeveloped northerly portion of the Hermosa Valley School site. Rezone to OS Open Space from R-3 Multiple Family Residential.

Area 4: 803, 805, 807, 809, 811, 813, 815, 817, and 819 18th Street; 802 and 804 19th Street; 181, 1820, 1822, 1830, 1834, 1840 and 1850 Pacific Coast Highway. Rezone from R-2 to Commercial S.P.A. Specific Plan Area.

Area 5: 1906, 1918, 1924, and 1934 Pacific Coast Highway. Rezone from R-2 to Commercial S.P.A. Specific Plan Area.

Area 6: 825, 827, 831, 833, 835, 841, and 844 13th Street; 830, 840 and 850 14th Street. Redesignate to MD Medium Density from GC General Commercial (with the exception of the R-1 lot, which should be redesignated to LD Low Density).

Area 7: 1235, 1245, 1251, and 1255 Prospect Avenue. Redesignate lot #40 to GC General Commercial and rezone the remaining parcels to R-1 One Family Residential from C-3 General Commercial.

Area 8: 725 10th Street and 730 11th Street. Rezone these properties to R-2 Two Family Residential from C-3 General Commercial.

Area 9: 603 1st Place, 620 2nd Street, and 112, 138 and 142 Ardmore Avenue. Rezone these properties to R-2 Two Family Residential from M-1 Light Manufacturing.

Area 10: 603, 605, 607, 609, 611, 613, 615, and 623 3rd Street; 322, 330 and 342 Ardmore Avenue. Rezone these properties to R-2 Two Family Residential from M-1 Light Manufacturing.

Area 11: 611, 615, and 635 4th Street; and 422-436 Ardmore Avenue. Rezone these properties to R-2 Two Family Residential from M-1 Light Manufacturing.

BUILDING INTENSITY/POPULATION DENSITY STANDARDS

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 1: Bring the Land Use Element into compliance with State law. S

Implementation Objective 1.1: Include specific floor area ratios (FARs) for all nonresidential land use designations. Based on the existing development character of nonresidential properties, an FAR of 1:1 should be considered. Proposed developments with an FAR greater than 1:1 would require Planning Commission approval. S

Implementation Objective 1.2: Provide a linkage between limits on the number of dwelling units per acre and the desired population by establishing estimates on the average number of persons per dwelling unit. Establish population threshold at buildout using the 1990 Census statistic of 1.98 Persons Per Occupied Housing Unit for the City and the existing residential standards on maximum dwelling units per acre. S

Implementation Objective 1.3: Establish density/intensity standard for the Mobile Home Park (MHP) land use designation. The existing low density character of the City's mobile home stock, totaling a gross density of 13.5 units per acre, and the low density structural height and bulk characteristics of mobile homes makes the LD Low Density standard of 13 units per acre appropriate for the MHP designation. S

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 2: Encourage maximum development potential of all nonresidential properties. **N/C**

Implementation Objective 2.1: Establish floor area ratios (FARs) for all nonresidential land use designations (see Implementation Objective 1.1). **S**

Implementation Objective 2.2: Allow off-site public parking and/or private parking within a reasonable distance to satisfy parking requirements. **E**

LAND USE DESIGNATION REVISIONS

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 1: Eliminate R-P zoning and replace with R-3 zoning, or create a new General Plan land use designation for residential/office mixes. **N/C**

Implementation Objective 1.1: Revise zoning map to reflect replacement of R-P zone with R-3 zone, or prepare new text and revise the General Plan Land Use Map for a mixed residential/office designation. **N/C**

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 2: Examine substandard lots such as the Shakespeare Tract for possible changes in General Plan designation and / or zoning designation and also explore creative design standards such as zero lot lines.

LAND USE AND STRUCTURAL DEFINITIONS

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 1: Provide clear and unambiguous guidance to decision-makers regarding land use entitlements by formulating precise zoning definitions for commercial and residential land uses and structural improvements. **E**

Implementation Objective 1.1: Prepare a zoning amendment to include definitions for all permitted uses, dual/multiple uses, and the following structural improvements and development features: attic, basement, grade, floor area, loft, and story. **E**

Implementation Policy 1.1-2: All lodging establishments, or portions thereof, that allow guests to stay more than 30 consecutive days shall be subject to the multiple dwelling parking standards, regardless of whether kitchen facilities are provided. **E**

PARKING VIS-A-VIS LAND USE

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 1: Maximize the use of public and private parking vis-a-vis all commercial land uses. **E**

Implementation Objective 1.1: Allow private sector construction and operation of downtown public parking structures. **E**

Implementation Objective 1.2: Study all publicly owned properties for feasibility as potential parking structure sites, including but not limited to Lots A, B, C, and D, Civic Center lots, and the Community Center lot. **E**

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 2: Allow shared parking arrangements for both existing commercial uses and future commercial developments. **E**

Implementation Objective 2.1: Prepare potential reduced parking requirement schedule for shared parking facilities. **E**

Implementation Objective 2.2: Assist commercial properties with potential for shared parking facilities. **E**

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 3: Refine parking requirements. **E**

Implementation Objective 3.1: Allow more "intense" commercial uses to locate into substandard commercial properties previously occupied by uses exempt from parking regulations if the required parking spaces over and above the parking requirement for the previous use can be provided on a discretionary basis. **E**

Implementation Objective 3.2: Assist future "intensive" use applicants to identify potential methods of satisfying the parking requirement from land use intensification, including off-site shared parking and tandem parking. **E**

OPEN SPACE/PUBLIC FACILITIES DESIGNATIONS

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 1: Create a special Public Facilities overlay district for all properties presently designated Open Space or Unclassified that contain educational buildings, public utility structures and corridors, public governmental buildings, public malls and plazas, and transit uses. **S**

Implementation Objective 1.1: Prepare zoning text for Public Facilities overlay district, which allows for adequate building height and mass, e.g. C-3 standards, and revise General Plan map and zoning map to include overlay district boundaries. **S**

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 2: Revise zoning text to identify only those types of uses which typically are found in Open Space zones. Examples of these uses are as follows: **S**

1. Aquatic sports facilities
2. Historic monuments
3. Parks
4. Picnic facilities

5. Playgrounds and children's recreational equipment
6. Recreational facilities and ancillary uses (indoor and outdoor)
7. Special events and group events authorized pursuant to Sections 22-1 and 22-5 of the Municipal Code
8. Spectator seating
9. Sports fields and courts
10. Trails for walking, jogging, bicycling and/or skating

USES OF PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY FOR PRIVATE PURPOSES

GOAL 1: To evaluate all city right-of-ways to determine whether or not there is any future public use and which right-of-ways could possibly be controlled by the encroachment process or vacated to decrease visual blight. N/C

Objective 1.1: Evaluate what right-of-ways could be controlled through the zoning ordinance which would trigger vacation. N/C

Objective 1.2: Examine what new zoning ordinances would be necessary for application toward these right-of-ways. N/C

Objective 1.3: A cost / benefit analysis needs to be made to determine what encroachment permit process is the optimum solution for private use of the public right-of-way areas for which the City has determined future need. E

Objective 1.4: Prior to either using the vacation method, or the encroachment permit process for unused public right-of-way areas, a thorough examination of the method of implementation, i.e., enforcement procedure, shall be made to determine the most effective procedure, and shall be made a criterion in deciding which method should be used.

PROPERTY MAINTENANCE

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 1: Ensure that all properties in the City are adequately maintained in order to protect the public safety, health and welfare. N/C

Implementation Objective 1.1: Amend the Municipal Code to specifically list all types of property maintenance deficiencies and establish an enforcement program. E

DESIGN REVIEW

GOAL 1: The Downtown Business Area Enhancement Commission should review all major development plans prior to discretionary approval or implementation when a proposed project is located within their jurisdictional boundaries. E

Primary Objective 1: Provide the Downtown Business Area Enhancement Commission with all applicable information as it pertains to the downtown without increasing the permit processing time. E

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 2: Incorporate design review into the regular site plan review procedures of the Planning Commission for Specific Plan Area (S.P.A.) zones, excluding single family residential, and major Capital Improvement Projects (C.I.P). E

Implementation Objective 2.1: Establish general guidelines for Planning Commission design review. Guidelines should be based on compatibility with surrounding properties to present a harmonious appearance. Planning Commission prohibitions on specific architectural features which are compatible with the surrounding area for reasons solely due to matters of personal taste are considered beyond the scope of the Planning Commission's duties. E

Examples of general guidelines for design review are as follows:

1. The height, bulk, and other design features of all structures should be in proportion to the building site with a balance and unity among external features so as to present a harmonious appearance.
2. The site layout, orientation, and location of structures and their relationship to one another and to open spaces, parking areas, pedestrian walks, signs, illumination, and landscaping should be interrelated and arranged as to achieve a safe, efficient, and harmonious development.
3. Each building shall reflect due consideration of a total design concept which shall be an integral part of the design treatment and architectural detail accomplished in a professional manner consistent with good design practices.
4. The grading and development should be accomplished with due regard for the qualities of the natural terrain and landscape; trees, shrubs, and other natural features should not be indiscriminately destroyed.
5. The design, size, lighting, placement, and character of signs should be appropriately related to the structures and grounds, and be in harmony with the general

development of the site and the surrounding neighborhood.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE 1: Establish a historic preservation program. **E**

Implementation Objective 1.1: Establish a set of guidelines to determine what criteria should apply in determining what type of buildings, structures, or sites should be considered for historical preservation. **E**

Implementation Objective 1.2: Investigate State and federal historic preservation programs applicable to local resources. **E**

Implementation Policy 1.2: Participation in any program shall be voluntary and if possible, a building that qualifies for historical preservation should be made afforded the opportunity for tax exemptions as an incentive. **E**

Implementation Policy 1.3: Examine what is to be achieved by the preservation of various historical sites. **N/C**

p/goalsum

COMMERCIAL SPACE ALTERNATIVE

COMMERCIAL SPACE ALTERNATIVE

I. General/Purpose

This alternative would encourage the utilization of the commercial zone and decrease the parking requirements to maximize the amount of commercial space.

Amortization of nonconforming residential uses is considered to be the most realistic approach to maximizing downtown commercial space. Allowing greater building heights in downtown is not feasible with the November 1991 voter approval of Proposition I, a local initiative which lowered commercial building heights in the C-2 zone (the downtown zoning designation) to 30 feet from 35 feet. Converting the existing downtown parking lots to commercial uses would simply exacerbate the existing public parking shortage, possibly discouraging shoppers from patronizing downtown merchants. Expanding the downtown commercial district boundaries by redesignating residential properties adjacent to the downtown periphery to GC General Commercial is not considered feasible by staff due to the following practical difficulties:

1. Market forces do not justify expanding the amount of land in a downtown district that has been economically depressed since the 1950's and, with a few notable exceptions, is characterized by marginal retail establishments and constant business turnovers.
2. Several downtown commercial properties are presently used for residential purposes, and have been residential in character for many years, indicating a greater demand for residential than commercial uses in and around downtown.
3. The existing residential properties abutting the downtown district are presently fully developed for residential uses. Redesignation of these residential properties would create legal nonconforming structures, with the associated restrictions on structural improvements/expansions, and possibly lead to displacement of renters.
4. The adjacent residential properties are of diminutive proportions by today's standards, reflecting the period of the City's history in which these properties were originally subdivided. Construction of any multi-tenant commercial space would require lot consolidation efforts that would be difficult for the private sector alone even in a healthy economy with strong local market demand. Given the lack of demand for additional downtown commercial space, private sector commitment to this type of commercial development would be remote at best.

II. Potential Advantages

1. Larger stock of downtown commercial structures provides opportunity for greater variety of retailers and greater selection of retail goods
2. New commercial construction would result in greater property tax revenues
3. Greater shopping opportunities that could attract a larger and more diversified shopper base
4. Opportunity for greater sales and business license tax revenues
5. Potential for increased employment opportunities
6. Promote downtown as a unified shopping district characterized by a variety of restaurants and specialty shops

III. Potential Disadvantages

1. Reduction in housing stock that could adversely impact City's supply of low and moderate income housing units
2. Potential increase in alcohol-related commercial uses
3. Greater intensification of day and night-time shoppers could create conflicts with nearby residents in terms of parking, accessibility, noise and lighting spillover effects

IV. Existing Downtown Conditions

The addresses, Assessor Parcel Numbers, lot square footage, existing land uses, and conditions of existing structures for all commercially zoned downtown properties that are presently used only for residential purposes are listed in Appendix A. Many residential structures on these properties exhibit signs of deferred maintenance.

Downtown presently has a total land area of 757,606 square feet and total floor area of 344,852 square feet for a total floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.46:1. Downtown presently has a total of 1,583 public and private parking spaces.

V. Future Downtown Conditions

The following floor space estimates represent the maximum potential commercial development that the entire downtown could support under current zoning standards. The calculations on maximum build-out for the entire downtown are based on the following assumptions:

- All future downtown commercial structures would be developed to provide the maximum amount of floor space possible, in conformance with the existing 30 foot height limitations, while allowing adequate space on the property for the full provision of all required off-street parking spaces, either at ground level of above ground.
- No non-commercial developments on any downtown properties (in order to estimate the maximum amount of retail floor space possible under current zoning).
- Commercial uses are broken down into two major categories, retail/office and restaurant, for convenient analysis. These retail and restaurant categories are distinguished by different off-street parking requirements: one space per 250 square feet of gross floor area for retail/office uses and one space per 100 square feet of gross floor area for restaurant uses.
- For calculation purposes, each required parking space represents 400 square feet of floor in order to account for all parking stall, aisle and drive area space needed for an adequate parking lot. This 400 square foot per space average is a recommended standard that comes from APA Report Number 405, New Residential Standards for Nonresidential Uses, 1987.
- Restaurants currently make up approximately 23% of all floor space in downtown. This scenario assumes that the downtown retail mix will retain roughly the same proportion of restaurants, with restaurants making up 25% of total downtown land and the remaining 75% devoted to general retail/office uses.

TABLE 7
MAXIMUM POTENTIAL RETAIL/OFFICE DEVELOPMENT (75% OF DOWNTOWN)
(Square Feet)

<u>Total Land Area</u>	<u>Total Floor Area</u>	<u>Total Parking Area</u>
568,205	655,621	1,048,993

TABLE 8
MAXIMUM POTENTIAL RESTAURANT DEVELOPMENT (25% OF DOWNTOWN)
(Square Feet)

<u>Total Land Area</u>	<u>Total Floor Area</u>	<u>Total Parking Area</u>
189,401	113,641	454,563

TABLE 9
MAXIMUM POTENTIAL COMBINED COMMERCIAL USES DEVELOPMENT
(Square Feet)

<u>Total Land Area</u>	<u>Total Floor Area</u>	<u>Total Parking Area</u>
757,606	769,262	1,503,556

The total number of parking spaces required for the maximum potential downtown development would be 2,622 retail/office spaces and 1,136 restaurant spaces. The parking area allocation only assumes that all spaces are off-street and above ground, with no determination on the potential ratio of surface level spaces to parking structure spaces. This determination is not necessary for aggregate projections since parking for some commercial land uses may be within the same parcels or entirely on separate parcels. Therefore, the FAR for any given parcel could theoretically be as much as 3:1 or under 1:1. The aggregate FAR for the entire downtown under this scenario is approximately 1.02:1, which represents the total floor space of all retail/office and restaurant land uses divided by the total land area of all downtown properties.

The future potential development of uses consistent with the C-2 zoning for these properties would mean the loss of 77 existing dwelling units. Applying the 1990 Census average of 1.98 persons per household for the City, this could result in the displacement of 152 local residents.

VI. Potential Environmental Impacts

Traffic/Circulation - The loss of existing residential units on the downtown commercially zoned properties would reduce the overall number of residential vehicle trips but would create the potential for additional shopper and downtown employee vehicle trips. Assuming that these commercially zoned properties are developed for retail uses rather than office uses, this would result in less vehicles trips during weekday AM and PM peak commuting periods and more vehicle trips during evening and weekend shopping hours.

Based on an average of 3 daily trips per 1,000 square feet of gross commercial retail floor area on a weekday and an average of 5 daily trips per 1,000 square feet of gross commercial retail floor area on a weekend day (Trip Generation, 4th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers), the maximum potential future commercial development for the entire downtown under this scenario could result in approximately 2,308 Average Daily Trips (ADT) on a weekday and 3,846 ADT on a weekend day. In comparison, the existing 344,852 square feet of commercial floor space in the existing downtown would generate 1,035 weekday ADT and 1,724 weekend ADT. Assuming that the existing 77 dwelling units in downtown each have two commuters that result in four weekday trips per unit and that weekend travel patterns result in six trips per unit on a weekend day, the existing downtown residential uses generate 308 weekday ADT and 462 weekend ADT. The present land uses in downtown therefore generate approximately 1,343 weekday ADT and 2,186 weekend ADT. Under this scenario, maximum commercial development would result in a 72% increase in weekday ADT and a 76% increase in weekend ADT, which would result in significant traffic volume increases. These calculations do not account for beach visitor trips, since it is assumed that these trips would occur regardless of the amount of commercial downtown space.

Air and Noise - Since total vehicle ADT could significantly increase with future commercial development, this scenario could result in significant mobile air and noise impacts. There may also be significant increases in evening and weekend pedestrian noise impacts from future additional commercial retail space. Since a large portion of this new commercial development would be located on properties along the downtown periphery, there is a potential for significant noise impacts on nearby residences from shopper activities, particularly during late evening and weekend shopping hours.

Public Services/Utilities - The replacement of existing residential uses on commercially zoned properties with commercial uses would increase the demand for police services, particularly if the future commercial uses involve activities that have higher police call rates, e.g. establishments with on-sale alcohol licenses. There is no accurate method of estimating the additional demand for police services, since a great many variables would determine the increased demand, such as the number of businesses with alcohol licenses, the hours of operation, the layout and intensity of new construction, and the time of day and season of the year. However, under maximum build-out it could be anticipated that growth in downtown businesses could result in a need for a regular dedication of two full-time officers and a patrol car or even the establishment of a downtown police substation, staffed by a minimum of a commander, two officers per shift, and at least two support personnel.

Depending on the type of future commercial uses, there could also be an increase in solid waste generation, since many types of retail and office uses result in greater quantities of discarded

paper and other refuse than residential uses, resulting in a greater demand for refuse collection services. The loss of residential units could mean a decrease in the demand for school, library, health care, water and sewer services, since residential uses typically have greater demands for these types of services than most commercial uses. The demand for fire protection services, particularly fire inspections, would increase with the additional commercial development.

Population/Housing - As previously mentioned, this scenario would result in a loss of 77 existing residential units and the displacement of about 152 residents, based on the 1990 Census average of 1.98 persons per household for the City. This would represent approximately 0.8% of the total 9,689 housing units and 0.8% of the total 18,219 residents for the City as reported by the 1990 Census. To the extent that some of these dwelling units could be considered affordable for low or moderate income households, any loss of such units could be considered a significant impact. However, given the high land value of beachfront property, it is unlikely that the rental rates or purchase prices of these existing residential units would be within the low and moderate income ranges.

Earth - Assuming that all future development would not involve any underground construction for parking garages or basements, any potential soil or ground surface disruptions would be limited to grading activities during the initial construction phases. Any changes in downtown topography and ground surface relief features would only potentially involve minor landscaping features, e.g. decorative slopes, on individual properties.

Water - Future commercial development on properties presently used for residential purposes could result in some increases in impervious surfaces, since existing residential lawns could be replaced with building or pavement cover. Although this could result in an increase in the rate and amount of surface water runoff and a decrease in the current absorption rates, the impacts would be less than significant since only a small amount of total land would be subject to potential conversion from open space to impervious surfaces. There would be no change in any potential exposure of people or property to water-related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves.

Aesthetics/Recreation - Maximum development could result in higher commercial structures than the existing one and two story residential structures on these commercially zoned properties. Since the existing residential structures are all below the maximum height of 30 feet allowed in the C-2 zone, future commercial development could potentially obstruct some scenic views from surrounding properties. This would be considered a less than significant impact, however, since all development would be in conformance with the C-2 zoning standards. Potential commercial development would not have an impact on the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities since the change in uses on these properties would not impact beach access.

Historic/Cultural Resources - Since none of the existing residential structures on these commercially zoned properties are considered to be of local historic significance, there would not be any impacts to historic sites, structures, buildings or objects.

VII. Fiscal Impacts

Based on the 1990 Census median value of \$431,000 for owner-occupied units, the 77 dwelling units located on commercially zoned downtown properties would have a total assessed value of \$33,187,000. This assessed valuation would provide the City with approximately \$79,649 in annual property tax revenues, based on the \$0.24 for every dollar of the basic 1% property tax levy allocated to the City. However, since many of the existing residential structures are older buildings and may be assessed at artificially low values if there have been no property improvements or resales in recent years, most of these residential structures probably have assessed valuations below the City median, particularly in the case of older multi-unit structures. Due to the beachfront locations of these properties, most of the assessed valuation would be for the land value rather than the improvement value. Therefore, it is probable that new commercial construction would result in higher assessed values that would produce greater property tax revenues for the City.

There are a total of 14 commercial parcels in downtown, totaling approximately 38,228 square feet, that are presently used for residences only. The maximum potential commercial development of these parcels would yield about 38,993 square feet of commercial floor space, applying the FAR of 1.02:1 that results from maximum development when all required parking spaces are provided on these parcels at or above ground. Full commercial development could result in approximately \$37,039 in annual sales tax revenues, estimated by multiplying the total square feet of retail and restaurant floor space by \$0.9499, which is the current amount of annual sales tax revenue per square foot of gross floor space for downtown.

Depending upon the type of future commercial uses, this scenario could result in several thousand dollars in business license fee revenues to the City annually. These fees are based on total gross receipts for most retail operations and on total floor space for retailers with an on-sale alcohol license.

VIII. Potential Coastal Commission Reaction

The replacement of nonconforming residential uses with commercial uses may be consistent with Coastal Commission policies depending upon the type of future commercial uses. Visitor-serving commercial recreational uses, e.g. gift shops, would be given a higher priority by the Commission than office uses. The California Coastal Act of 1976, Section 30222, states that "the use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private

residential, general industrial, or general commercial development". Although the Coastal Act does not specifically define "visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities," the City's Land Use Element currently defines commercial recreational land uses as various commercial activities such as bowling alleys, motels, theaters, entertainment establishments, night-clubs, shops and similar businesses. The establishment of any of these types of commercial uses could be expected to be supported by the Commission.

IX. Relationship to R/UDAT

The Regional/Urban Design Assistance Team (R/UDAT) program, sponsored by the American Institute of Architects (AIA), has recently completed a team study of downtown Hermosa Beach. The purpose of the R/UDAT study is to identify key issues through workshops and community input sessions in order to develop a conceptual action plan for downtown revitalization. The intent of this alternative, to increase the amount of commercial development in the downtown, would be consistent with the economic revitalization goals of the R/UDAT study. Specific R/UDAT recommendations such as the sale and commercial development of the Biltmore site is consistent with a downtown revitalization approach that favors the maximum utilization of downtown properties.

X. Implementation

Any implementation of this alternative would require an amortization program to successfully induce any additional downtown commercial uses. The lack of an amortization program would allow the opportunity for the existing nonconforming uses to continue indefinitely. However, even with an amortization program, the lack of market demand for additional downtown commercial space could make implementation difficult (otherwise market forces alone would have resulted in the replacement of these nonconforming residential structures with commercial uses).

GOAL

A. Maximize commercial uses on downtown commercial properties.

OBJECTIVES

- A. No expansion of the downtown nonconforming uses and encourage businesses to more effeciently use the commercial potential of the downtown district.
- B. Encourage new businesses and more efficient commercial space utilization of downtown district.

The following is a list of the R/UDAT guidelines to be used as a basis for the planning of the downtown district:

1. Downtown Business District needs more landscaping to soften the expanse of pavement and make the area more pleasant for pedestrians.
2. The street plantings on Pier Avenue should be different from Hermosa Avenue. Street tree plantings should be moved from the center of the street to the sidewalk to soften the commercial facades.
3. In the curved, sloping section of Pier Avenue between Hermosa Avenue and Manhattan Avenue a different, smaller type of street tree should be used to avoid blocking views of the water.
4. The bike path needs to be separated from the Strand for safety reasons.
5. Increase police foot patrols.
6. Increase outdoor dining and family entertainment activity where appropriate.
7. Provide streetscape amenities.
8. Create more sidewalk area and a plaza area at the pierhead.
9. Reduce noise impacts of bars and restaurants.
10. Connect through to parking behind buildings, creating through block retail arcades if possible.
11. A traffic circulation scheme should be provided at the Pier Avenue / Strand junction which gives easy access to parking areas. The recommended scheme allows drivers to go to the end of Pier Avenue and park there if space is available. If not, they can turn right to Lot C, or left to Lot A.
12. Manage the parking supply to reduce conflicts between residents, beach goers, and customers.
13. Provide sufficient off and on-street parking to support existing commercial uses and their proposed growth.
14. Provide beach-goers parking to the extent which is practically feasible, but never below the levels decreed by the Coastal Commission.
15. Fringe parking should be provided and its use promoted for beach goers, employees and overflow resident parking.
16. The zoning in downtown should be amended to allow businesses to expand without providing required parking for old or new uses.
17. Better information should be provided on visitor parking maps with an explanation of fees.

18. The pedestrian environment should be improved on streets leading to fringe parking facilities, amenities, store fronts, etc., and should be designed to encourage the use of these routes.

19. Pier Avenue between Hermosa Avenue and the beach should be modified to allow for more of an emphasis on pedestrian activities in this socially active zone.

20. Underground all utilities.

21. Diversify the types of businesses to include a greater number and variety of speciality shops, including gift, art and apparel shops, along Pier Avenue, the Strand, and other east-west streets.

22. Redesign of the pierhead area to improve the appearance of the pier structure and provide a plaza-like setting for outdoor events.

23. Revision of the traffic circulation pattern to provide a single one-way traffic lane with angled parking west of Hermosa Avenue. This revision provides more space for the pedestrian and room for outdoor cafes.


Expanded Downtown Business Area Enhancement District

LEGEND



Proposed Expanded Area

Existing Downtown Business Area Enhancement District Boundary



Scale: NTS



Expanded Business District Area Assessment District

Legend

Proposed Expansion

Area

Existing Business Area
Expansion District
Boundary



CALIFORNIA
Prepared by the Planning Department

Prepared by the Planning Department

HD - HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 33 du/ac
MD - MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 25 du/ac
LD - LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 13 du/ac
SPA - SPECIFIC PLAN AREA
GC - GENERAL COMMERCIAL
NC - NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL
CR - COMMERCIAL RECREATION
MHP - MOBILE HOME PARK
IND - INDUSTRIAL
OS - OPEN SPACE
- - - GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION BOUNDARIES

AMENDED	
5/14/87	28
11/30/87	28
11/1/88	28.
1/14/89	28.
1/15/89	28.
1/27/89	28.
1/31/90	28.
6/23/90	28.
10/15/90	L.H.
12/11/91	L.H.
1/5/93	28.



U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C101696632